UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,551	04/10/2006	Yukio Nagasaki	2006-0538A	8962
513 7590 05/15/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			EXAMINER	
			HAQ, SHAFIQUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/575,551	NAGASAKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SHAFIQUL HAQ	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ap	oril 2006					
· <u> </u>	•					
<i>7</i> —	· 					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1933 C.D. 11, 433 C.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
· · · · ·	· <u> </u>					
o) Claim(a) <u>1-70</u> are subject to resultation and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	(PTO-413) te				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

 This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. The species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

2. The "polymer chain with a chargeable group-carrying recurring unit" and the "nonionic hydrophilic polymer chain or segment" encompasses a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds. As for example, the nonionic hydrophilic polymer chain may be selected from polymer units such as polyethylene grycol, poly(vinyl alcohol), poly(vinyl pyrrolidone and poly(N,N-dimethylacrylamide, which are distinct with respect to their structures and functions. The polymer chain carrying a chargeable group may be composed of monomers that are structurally and functionally distinct. As for example, the monomer of formula (A) is structurally and functionally distinct. Further, with different substitution group, each of the formula encompasses a large number of structurally distinct compounds that would be functionally distinct as well. These structurally and functionally distinct groups in different combinations with different nonionic polymer would generate an inordinately large number of structurally and functionally distinct fine particle having distinct reactivities. Therefore, the compounds encompassed by "nonionic hydrophilic polymer" and "polymer chain carrying a chargeable group" differ materially in chemical functionality and are structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds, which do not possess a substantial common core and Pursuant to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT

Administrative instructions, Annex B, Part 1 (f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents and thus the species described above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

3. Therefore, Applicants are required to elect a single species for "nonionic hydrophilic polymer" and a single species for "polymer chain carrying a chargeable group" in accordance with the practice set forth in MPEP 803.02 by electing a single monomer unit for each, including an exact definition of each and every substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is selected.

Chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrefutable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holding of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

Upon the election of a single disclosed compound, the scope of the invention, inclusive of the elected compound, will be identified by the Examiner for examination

Page 4

along with the elected species. Moreover, whatever specific compound is ultimately elected, applicants are required to list all claims readable thereon. In the instant case, upon election of a single compound, the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound, but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound will be determined. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with (if appropriate) the process of using or making said compound under examination. This will be set forth by reference to specific class(es) and subclass(es) examined.

4. The species described above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT Administrative instructions, Annex B, Part 1 (f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents. Art Unit: 1641

5. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the compound are not patentably distinct species, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the compound to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Page 5

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must also include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Art Unit: 1641

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied

by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(1)

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shafigul Haq whose telephone number is 571-272-

6103. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/575,551 Page 7

Art Unit: 1641